



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELLCOTT CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-3467
TDD 410-313-2323

March Minutes

The third regular meeting for the year 2010 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, March 4, 2010 in the Tyson Room II located at 8930 Stanford Boulevard in Columbia, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairman; Samuel Crozier, Vice Chairman; Eileen Tennor, Secretary, Lisa Badart and Robert Tennenbaum

Staff present: Samantha Stoney, Mina Hilsenrath, Dan Bennett, Jim Vannoy and Carol Stirn

Chairman Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. He asked the Commission members if there were any changes to the February 3, 2010 minutes. Chairman Hauser made a motion to Approve the minutes as written; Lisa Badart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. #08-03c – 3546 Church Road, Ellicott City
2. #08-34c – 3546 Church Road, Ellicott City
3. #10-03 – 13550 Triadelphia Mill Road, Highland, HO-171
4. #10-04 – 8765 Frederick Road, Ellicott City
5. #10-05 – 8454 Frederick Road, Ellicott City
6. #10-06 – 8125 Main Street (rear of property, which faces St. Paul Street)

#08-03c – 3546 Church Road, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Frank Todd Taylor

Background& Scope of Work: The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$7,400 was expended on eligible pre-approved work to replace the roof on the house. The Applicant seeks \$740 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The roof replacement complies with the work pre-approved on August 6, 2008.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of \$740 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Ms. Stoney informed the Commission that the Applicant could not be present at the meeting, and if the Commission had questions for the applicant the case could be continued to the April meeting. After the case was introduced, Mr. Hauser asked the Commission if there were any objections or questions. No one had any comments.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the final tax credit. Ms. Badart seconded. The vote was unanimous to approve.

#08-34c – 3546 Church Road, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Frank Todd Taylor

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$88,097.97 was expended on work to the house. The applicant seeks \$8,809.79 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: After reviewing the previous meetings recording, minutes and applications, Staff determined that not all of the work was pre-approved for tax credits. The shutters, front door and termite damage were not pre-approved for tax credits. The transom and casement windows are new construction, not in-kind replacement and therefore not eligible. Also, the total for the lpe should be \$550 instead of \$600. After removing the cost for the shutters, front door, transom window and termite damage from the total, the adjusted figure is \$83,035.97, or \$8,303.60 in final tax credits.

Staff requested additional information regarding the termite damage. The Applicant indicated the termite damage was on the right side on the front of the house. The studs supporting the wall were destroyed and water seeped into the room. The contractor replaced the wall studs and replastered the walls. The replacement of the studs is structural and could have been eligible if pre-approved, however, the replastering of the walls is interior and not eligible.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of adjusted figure of \$8,303.60 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser asked if the Applicant had been advised of the adjusted tax credits. Ms. Stoney replied he was informed.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the final tax credit as adjusted by Staff. Mr. Crozier seconded. The vote was unanimous to Approve.

#10-03 – 13550 Triadelphia Mill Road, Highland, HO-171

Advisory comments for subdivision without demolition.

Applicant: Robert B. White/Hedgerow Farm LLC

Background & Scope of Work: The house is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-171, Left Out-Left Over or Hedgerow. According to the MHT form, the building dates approximately to 1878, but has had additions and alterations over time. The Applicant proposes to re-subdivide the 33-acre parcel into five buildable lots using the cluster subdivision option. A 1.5-acre lot will be created around the existing manor house, which is proposed to be expanded with a new addition. A 28.5-acre buildable preservation parcel will include the existing outbuildings and a new residence. Three lots, about 1-acre each, will be created for new construction.

Staff Comments: The proposed subdivision preserves the historic manor house, outbuildings, and site features. Staff has no objection to the proposal.

Testimony: Chairman Hauser swore in the project engineer, Bruce Burton of LDE. Mr. Burton, using a color rendered site plan, explained that the property is comprised of over thirty-three acres and is zoned RR-DEO - Rural Residential-Density Exchange Option. Mr. Burton explained that under the zoning the property could be subdivided into three-acre lots, for a total of eleven lots. He stated the Applicants propose to create five total lots: one lot around the existing manor house, one lot near the boxwood hedgerow, one large residue preservation parcel around the existing pool house and two one-acre cluster lots on the front portion of the property. The pool house would be expanded and would be the principle residence on the residue parcel. The two one acre cluster lots will be in between two stream beds, each with a 100-foot streambank buffer. Mr. Burton stated the required streambank buffer is 100-feet because the property is located within the Triadelphia Reservoir Watershed; otherwise it would normally be a 75-foot required buffer from the top of the streambank.

The manor house has a detached garage and an exercise room. The owner proposes to build an addition from the end of the manor house to the garage. The tennis court, shed and barn complex, swimming pool, pool house and boxwood hedgerows will remain. The two additional lots at the front of the property will be accessed by a driveway, using an old logging trail to minimize disturbance of the existing Chestnut forest. The two new lots at the front of the property are on part of an existing forest conservation easement, so the two acres of forest area will be replaced by forest conservation elsewhere on the property. The owners plan to keep horses on the property. This will be a family complex: one owner will live in the manor house, the other owner in a new house, one owner's son will be in the expanded pool house and two daughters will live in the houses at the front of the property. Mr. Tennenbaum asked if the house addition has been designed. Mr. Burton stated it is in the preliminary architecture stage and he could show an elevation and floor plan. Mr. Hauser stated the Commission does not have any requirement to review the architectural design.

Mr. Hauser asked about some of the pasture area and if it would be replanted. Mr. Burton stated that they are open areas at this time and would be reforested. He also stated that an extensive tree survey was in process, but the idea is to design the lots to not disturb trees and keep as many as possible. Mr. Crozier asked if they will be removing trees between houses because of the sewage easement. Mr. Burton stated he addressed this with the Health Department; all the lots are field tested and perc certification plans have been submitted. Mr. Burton pointed out that in Howard County, 1/3 of the sewage area for initial construction is cleared, and the other 2/3 will remain in trees. Mr. Burton said this is a fine example of historic preservation, and that the present owners will return the property back the way it should be.

Mr. Hauser asked for any public comment. There was none.

Recommendations: The Commission was satisfied with the site plan and had no recommendations.

#10-04 – 8765 Frederick Road, Ellicott City

Advisory comments for demolition and new construction.

Applicant: Carol Eldringhoff, Ashley Custom Homes

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1899. The property is not located within the Ellicott City Historic District and is before the Commission for Advisory Comments for the demolition and new construction because it is a historic resource. The demolition does not require a Certificate of Approval. The homeowner proposes to demolish the existing historic house, which he has resided in for over 26 years, and construct a Cape Cod style house. The house is currently set back 7.5

feet from the street. The property is zoned RE-D, which requires a 75-foot front setback. However, the Applicant is proposing a 20-foot front setback, which will require a zoning variance.

Staff Comments: The existing historic house has a side gabled roof and is a three-bay wide building. Staff would prefer the house not be demolished. The house is located close to Frederick Road, as is typical for historic homes in this area. However, because the house stands alone, the proposed 20 foot setback will not adversely affect the aesthetic of the street. The County Architectural Historian will document the building prior to the issuing of a demolition permit.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Carol Eldringhoff of Ashley Custom Homes. Ms. Eldringhoff stated her client wishes to demolish the existing house, because of its poor condition, and wants to replace it with a single story home for himself and his wife. They plan to install a Cape Cod modular home with a porch across the front. The new home would have a 20-foot setback from the road, instead of the current 7.5 feet. This would allow the owner to have parking on the property, instead of parking on Frederick Rd.

Mr. Crozier asked about the limits of the floodplain. Ms. Eldringhoff said the floodplain contour is 282 feet on the back of the property. The proposed house cannot be located any farther back because of the floodplain, so a variance will be needed to accommodate the proposed 20-foot front setback. Ms. Badart asked if the current house had aluminum siding and replacement windows. Ms. Eldringhoff replied that it does. Ms. Badart asked if any consideration was given to removing the second floor and turning the house into a one-story building. Ms. Eldringhoff stated due to the age of the home, the homeowner was not in favor of pursuing that option. She said the new house will be more energy efficient.

Mr. Hauser commented that there are few existing homes in this area outside the historic district and that, with the exception of the stone house, they are nondescript. He noted that he would like to see the house stay or have a very similar house built in place of the present one. Ms. Tennor asked if any outbuildings are being removed. Ms. Eldringhoff stated they will all remain. Ms. Eldringhoff said there will be a paved or gravel driveway on the right side of the house, but there will not be a garage. Mr. Crozier commented that the proposed home is not a custom architectural design. Ms. Eldringhoff explained the new house will be a modular systems built house. Mr. Crozier feels it would fit in better with the neighborhood if more historic details would be added. Ms. Eldringhoff stated that there will be a porch all the way across the front, similar to the existing house.

Recommendations: Some Commission members expressed interest in retaining the house and others indicated they would prefer to see architectural detail similar to that of other homes in the area added to the new house.

10-05 –8454 Frederick Road, Ellicott City

Replace windows and doors, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Nathan Sowers

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the house dates to 1899. The Applicant is the contract purchaser for the property. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing wood windows with Anderson 200 series vinyl clad wood windows. The Applicant also proposes to replace the existing wooden doors, but has not provided information regarding the proposed doors. Staff has requested information on the proposed doors.

Staff Comments: The house is located on Frederick Road, but is set back across the creek. The house is highly visible in the winter. In the summer the house is visible, but also has a substantial tree cover.

The house currently has a variety of window types, some 6:6 and 2:2. The Applicant indicated the lite arrangement of the proposed windows would be the same as the existing. The windows appear to be the original wood windows and do not appear to be in bad condition from the photographs provided. One of the windows is under a porch and protected from the elements and the other appears to have a storm window over it which should provide protection as well. The windows are not standard sizes and Staff is concerned replacement windows would not properly fit into the existing openings, some of which are stone. The Guidelines (page 40) recommend “maintain and repair original window openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim.” However, if the Commission decides to approve the request for replacement windows, according to the Guidelines (page 40), “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frame and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, materials, finish and window pane configuration.” The window openings should not be made larger or smaller if replacement windows are approved.

The existing doors all appear to be original to the house. Some of the doors are solid wood, 6-paneled, 4-paneled and 1 lite over 3 panels. The Applicant has not specified what the replacement doors will look like, other than wood painted white. This work may be eligible for tax credits. The Guidelines (page 38) recommend against “changing the size of door openings.” If the Commission approves the use of the proposed replacements door, the doors should fit the existing openings. The Guidelines (page 38) recommend against “unnecessarily replacing original doors and entrance features on historic buildings.” Staff recommends repair and weather stripping if there are concerns about energy efficiency. In replacement is still desired, Staff recommends the doors and windows be replaced in-kind with wood. Repair or in-kind replacement would be eligible for tax credits. The Commission should determine whether they find vinyl clad wood to be eligible for tax credits.

Staff Recommendations:

- 1) Staff recommends the original wood windows and doors be repaired or replaced in-kind with wood to fit existing openings for tax credit pre-approval.
- 2) If replacement windows and doors are determined to be acceptable, Staff recommends they match the existing lite arrangement and fit the existing openings without being made larger or smaller. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for wooden doors contingent upon receiving an acceptable product information sheet, but not for the vinyl clad windows.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in the Applicant, Nathan Sowers. Mr. Sowers explained that he would like to use the Anderson 200 series to make the replacements more affordable. He stated there are a number of windows to be replaced and feels the stock series windows will fit into the structure. Also on the stone section of the house, there is exterior wood trim which could be put back on, after the windows are put in, without having to adjust the window opening. Mr. Sowers plans to replace the windows with the same lite series, 6:6 and 2:2. He would like to replace the doors with single lite wooden doors to allow light to filter into the house. He explained the door used for the second story porch is an interior door and that some doors have been hung upside down so the knobs are very low. Mr. Sowers would like to replace the front door on the ground floor porch with a 6:6 window series and the same 3-panel arrangement on the bottom.

Mr. Hauser asked if the proposed 200 series would have applied grilles on the outside and inside. Mr. Sowers stated they would. He wants to keep the house looking historic, but make the house more efficient and safe, and have operable windows.

Mr. Hauser said the 200 series window is not an appropriate choice. A more appropriate window would be a custom-made window to fit the openings or a sashpack window. Mr. Hauser explained that this is an important historic house in Ellicott City and it needs to be preserved. Mr. Hauser said the Anderson windows are too modern for this structure. Mr. Hauser stated the windows in the stone part have a wide trim and bead; if the windows are replaced with a different size, it will completely change the effect. The width of the muntins and beading must be maintained on the windows. Mr. Crozier asked if tax credits could be applied if the Applicant looked for a more appropriate window. Mr. Hauser confirmed it would be eligible and Ms. Stoney explained the Applicant should also look into the state 20% tax credit program. Mr. Hauser also suggested that the original windows could be fixed and made workable, plus storms could be applied for to protect them. Mr. Sowers asked if vinyl windows are ever approved for historic in the historic district or for tax credits. Mr. Hauser stated they are almost never approved, but that every property has a different condition. They may be approved for areas not visible from the public right of way, depending upon how significant the building is.

Mr. Hauser swore in Kimberly Kepnes, who is assisting Mr. Sowers with the application. She expressed her desire to figure out how Mr. Sowers can get windows approved that are efficient, operable and in keeping with the historic nature of the structure. Ms. Kepnes thinks there must be a replacement window that maintains the trim and bead but gives the homeowner the ability to have the efficiency in a semi-custom window that is affordable. There was some discussion about the house's setback from the road and how visible it is. Mr. Crozier explained that the visibility isn't as important as maintaining the integrity of the historic structure. He also stated the Applicant should explore other options for windows that would be more appropriate and fit in with the historic structure.

Mr. Crozier asked if the recommendation is to keep the two window types different between the original building and the addition. The Commission members preferred keeping both types. Mr. Hauser stated the 6:6 on the stone and 2:2 on the panel should be kept, plus maintaining the same pattern. Mr. Hauser asked how many total windows are on the house. Ms. Kepnes said there are two windows on the rear of the house, three on the south side, three north side and one dormer. She asked if the 200 series could be considered on windows that cannot be seen, such as on the side and back of the house and the dormer. Mr. Hauser asked if these windows could be seen from neighboring apartments. Ms. Kepnes stated they cannot be seen. She stated the 200 series would be a good option for the rear and the north and south gable ends of the stone, and Mr. Sowers could explore additional options for windows on the front.

Ms. Kepnes explained the Applicant would like to install a 6-lite top and 3-panel bottom door to match the 6:6 windows in the stone. She stated the two doors in the stone front facade are not believed to be the original doors. Ms. Badart asked how many total doors are on the building. Ms. Kepnes stated there are five total doors; three on the front, one on the side and one on the rear. The two front doors in the stone portion are currently wood. Ms. Kepnes explained that because the stone portion has no side or rear windows, the idea was to add light to use the doors to the building and match the existing window configuration by installing a solid wood French door with a 6-lite top and a 3-panel bottom. The upper and lower level porch doors would be done this way to match. Mr. Hauser asked why a simple single lite 2-panel door, more typically seen in Ellicott City, could not be used. Ms. Kepnes explained they thought it would look nice to match the door with the windows, but the simple door could also be a consideration. Mr. Crozier stated he likes the solid door in the stone part and that if the door is done 6:6 to match the windows, it would take away the contrast provided by the solid mass of a door. Mr. Hauser reconfirmed a single lite, 2-panel door is more appropriate for Ellicott City. Mr. Tennenbaum concurred that the simple door would be better, with either a single or 2-panel bottom. Ms. Kepnes asked if this

same design could be used for the 4 doors – the upper and lower level porch doors, the addition front door and the kitchen side door. Mr. Hauser stated the doors could all be the same. Ms. Kepnes also stated they planned on replacing the rear door with a solid 3-panel replacement. Mr. Tennenbaum added the two panels of the single lite door should be vertical to match the expression of the house.

Mr. Hauser stated that tax credits would be approved for the doors if they are wood, and if an agreement on the appropriate windows is reached, the wood windows would also be approved for tax credits.

Mr. Hauser asked if the doors would be slab or pre-hung. Ms. Kepnes stated she was not sure, but the doors are available in either type and stated that the slab would probably be better for the stone. Mr. Hauser stated the pre-hung would work for the wood addition, but the Applicant should try to match the trim, and use slab for the stone section. Ms. Kepnes verified the doors to be used: two pre-hung, single lite, 2-panel doors for the wood addition; two slab, single lite, 2-panel doors for the stone; one wood pre-hung, solid 3-panel door for the rear, all with vertical panels to match.

The Commission reconfirmed their understanding of the amended proposal. There are seven windows on the front and six windows on the side and rear. All of the windows will be white. The Anderson 200 series would be used for the side and back windows and gable. Mr. Hauser stated that the fronts and sides will be divided lites, the fronts will not be true divided, but simulated divided. Wood windows must be used on the front and left side. Ms. Stoney asked for clarification that the Commission was okay with a clad wood and Mr. Hauser stated that a clad wood is fine and the Applicant must obtain Staff approval for the seven windows to be used on the front. Mr. Bennett further clarified the Applicant must seek Staff approval before ordering the windows for the front to ensure that they will fit the openings. The windows on the two sides of the house can be Anderson 200 series but have to maintain a lite configuration the same as the front. Mr. Hauser stated that no trim will be added to the front windows.

Motion: Chairman Hauser moved to accept an amended petition to allow Staff approval of the seven windows on the front contingent upon:

- 1) The windows must fit the size of the openings without changing any exterior trim.
- 2) The windows must be wood.
- 3) The windows can be sashbacks or custom built.
- 4) The windows must match the lite configuration of the existing - 6:6 in the stone, 2:2 in the addition.
- 5) The new selection must be brought to Staff for approval before ordering.
- 6) The windows on the two sides can be similar to the rest of windows using the Anderson 200 series, but the side windows must have applied grilles to match the lite configuration of the front of the house.

The five doors approved are:

- 1) Two or three of the doors will be pre-hung on the addition with a single lite over 2-panels.
- 2) Two or three of the doors will be slab on the stone building with a single lite over 2-panels.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Crozier. The vote was unanimous to approve.

#10-06 – 8125 Main Street (rear of property, which faces St. Paul Street)

Demolition and new construction.

Applicant: Charles Alexander

Background and Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to demolish an existing garage and barn located along St. Paul Street in order to construct a 4-unit multi-family apartment building. The property technically has a Main Street address, but is located behind Caplan's Department Store. An application to demolish the existing structures and construct a new building was applied for and approved in 2006 as HDC-06-04. The design of the building has changed since the 2006 submission. The proposed building will be a 6 bay wide unit and have two stories at street level, similar to other buildings along the street. The materials on the building will be:

- 1) Siding – Khaki Brown HardiePlank lap siding in a smooth finish
- 2) Trim – Duron Roycroft Bottle Green
- 3) Roof – Berridge-Medium Bronze standing seam metal
- 4) Front doors – Brown, raised 4-panel metal doors
- 5) Lighting – Recessed in entry ceilings
- 6) Stone – veneer, gray range of colors
- 7) Railings – black steel pickets
- 8) Windows – Jeld-Wen aluminum clad wood 1:1, casement and picture

The building will be primarily covered in HardiePlank lap siding on the south elevation, but on the east, west and north elevations a significant amount of the lower half of the building will be covered with a stone veneer. The south elevation will have a small amount of stone veneer showing, which resembles the foundations of nearby buildings.

The windows on the front of the building will be a mixture of small fixed windows and 1:1 double hung windows. The windows on the rear of the building will be casement and picture windows.

Staff Comments:

Demolition

The Applicant stated the reason for demolition is "the two garages are structurally unsound for any re-use, are too close to the road for continued safe use as garages, and are obsolete to any current active use." Section 301 of the Rules of Procedure indicate that documentary evidence must be submitted to support the demolition request. The Applicant has not submitted any documentation substantiating the need for demolition other than above statement. The County Architectural Historian has an expressed an interest in documenting the structures, especially the barn, if the demolition is to be approved. The Rules of Procedure also indicate that before the Commission acts on an application for demolition, they shall determine whether the buildings are Structures of Unusual Importance, which are defined by Section 302 (page 14-15) of the Rules of Procedure as:

- 1) Structures deemed by the Commission to be of unusual importance to the Nation, State or County, whose loss would cause great damage to the character and integrity of the historic district.
- 2) Determination that a structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance shall be based on criteria in its adopted guidelines, the testimony of expert witnesses or other documentary evidence presented to the Commission.

If the Commission determines the structures are of Unusual Importance, the following apply:

- 1) The structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the County; or
- 2) Retention of the structure would cause undue financial hardship to the owner; or
- 3) Retention of the structure would not be in the interest of a majority of the persons in the

community.

However, if the Commission determines the structures to be of Unusual Importance, the burden of proof is on the Applicant to establish that one of the conditions cited in Rule 303.B.1 applies. Additional procedures for demolition are explained in the following sections of the Rules of Procedure.

If the Commission determines the structures are not of Unusual Importance, they shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards in Section 16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines. The standards of 16.607 are:

- 1) The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.
- 2) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.
- 3) The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and material proposed to be used.
- 4) Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.

Staff has no objection to the proposed demolition because the structures in their current state detract from the integrity of the historic district, while the proposed new construction would promote a continuity of residential housing along St. Paul Street.

New Construction

Chapter 8.B (page 57) of the Guidelines recommends “design new buildings to be compatible with neighboring buildings in bulk, ratio of height to width, and the arrangement of door and window openings.” Overall the design of the new construction appears to be compatible with the existing residential structures along St. Paul Street. However, the building is wider than any residential building on the street. This is accentuated by the placement of the doors at the end of the building instead of in the middle, like the neighboring two-story red duplex. Chapter 8.B (page 57) recommends “integrate a new building wider than neighboring buildings by breaking the new building façade into sections that are similar to the widths of neighboring buildings.”

Although the windows on the south façade are a mixture of styles, they are placed uniformly in rows and columns and are visually cohesive. The windows on the west façade are also aligned and visually cohesive. No actual windows appear on the east elevation, although openings with windows beyond are proposed. The windows on the back of the building are a mix of casement and pictures windows and appear to be placed in response to interior layout. The windows will not be visible from the street and appear to provide considerable, desirable light into the proposed apartments.

For new construction, Chapter 8.B (page 58) of the Guidelines recommend using “materials common to the historic district, such as wood siding, wood shingles, brick, stone or stucco.” However, Chapter 6.D (page 30) states “composite siding materials may be used to replace wood siding on non-historic buildings if the particular material proposed is compatible in appearance with the building itself and with wood siding used on nearby historic buildings.” Chapter 8.B of the Guidelines (page 59) recommends against using imitation stone siding. The use of trim on the front and sides of the building is traditional; however, on the rear of the building the trim is more contemporary and is used on fiber cement panels framing several windows.

Chapter 8.B.3 (page 59) of the Guidelines recommends “use roofing materials compatible with materials used elsewhere in the historic district.” The use of the metal roof is consistent with this Guideline and with Chapter 6.E (page 31) which explains “historic roofing materials include wood shingles, metal and

slate.”

The use of the black metal railing complies with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal.” The outdoor lighting also complies with Chapter 9.E (page 71) recommendations “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive” and “direct or shield lighting so that it does not create glare or spill onto neighboring properties.”

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends Approval of new construction contingent upon Approval of demolition as determined by the Commission

Testimony: Chairman Hauser swore in the architect, Charles Alexander. Mr. Hauser requested the history on the previous application. Mr. Alexander explained that there were problems with the number of units on the old application. The new application will reduce the density from the previously proposed 8 units to 4 units. He stated there is also an existing water easement which runs through the property. The new proposal places the building within the easement, so that the easement will not have to be moved. Mr. Hauser asked if the design of the building was similar to the old proposal. Mr. Alexander said it is similar. The previous plan had stairs in the middle of the facade which went down through two buildings, and the buildings were linked by a roof form across the top. One of the buildings from the previous plan was removed and the current plan has one building. Mr. Alexander explained the idea was to create a simple two story building that is commonly seen along the street. He also wanted to use the idea of sliding doors from the old garage and place them over the openings where the stairs are located on street level. The building will have a courtyard on the lower level which will allow light into the units. The building facade will resemble traditional design themes, without being an exact replica, and will fit within the scale of the street.

Mr. Tennenbaum asked if there were high ceilings under the shed roof along the street. Mr. Alexander said there were and clerestory windows will be installed. He explained that heavy timber framing will be used, but it will not be used on the interior in the rear because of the stacked duplexes which have fire separation between the upper and lower. All the other floors and roof structures will be exposed heavy timber. Mr. Tennenbaum asked if the garage doors are operable. Mr. Alexander stated the doors will be fixed open and on a track.

Mr. Tennenbaum asked if consideration has been given to breaking up the facade, perhaps by using trim or reveal, so the building would look like two townhouses rather than one building. Mr. Alexander stated he chose to create the look of one building, but would take it into consideration. Mr. Tennenbaum also said the right side corner stone wall looks awkward compared to the left side. Mr. Alexander stated that a column could be put in to also define the corner on the right. Ms. Tennor agreed with the suggestion to break up the facade of the building because it is longer than the others along the street. Mr. Crozier said the building looks too contemporary and that the facade looks long without detail in it. Mr. Crozier said the building looks out of scale and it does not appear to fit in the area. Mr. Alexander stated that the historic criteria was used in planning the building, but if the scale does not match the criteria, the facade could be adjusted. Mr. Tennenbaum said the proportions on the elevation were good, but the distances between the windows do not appear to all be the same. He also stated that the trim on the corners simply stops and does not go all the way down. Mr. Alexander stated that placing a column on the corner would continue the trim line.

Ms. Badart stated she thinks the building fits the scale of the street. She asked if the window widths are comparable to the other buildings. Mr. Alexander stated the windows are the same size. Ms. Badart said

the building compliments the materials used on neighboring buildings and that although the building is contemporary, it acknowledges the surrounding features. Mr. Hauser stated that HardiPlank should not be used, he would prefer to see German siding. Mr. Hauser stated that he does not consider this to be new construction. He said it needs to be compatible with and maintain the character of the street, and does not believe this building does that. Ms. Badart stated that the building is new construction. Mr. Crozier stated that the façade needs more work. Ms. Stoney pointed out the buildings along St. Paul Street are very simple and do not have a lot of ornamentation. Mr. Alexander said that the building responds to the context and is conservative along the street. He believes the guidelines provide leeway to create new buildings, but he was open to suggestions and to making changes to have the building fit. Mr. Crozier stated the building does not fit the scale of the street, and would like the Applicant to explore more alternatives and then come back to the Commission.

Mr. Tennenbaum stated that the clerestory windows are necessary to the proportion of the front elevation. He says the proportions are fine and likes the different window spacings in the back and the unit layout. Ms. Tennor stated she agrees that the clerestory windows make the façade look more modern, but does not object to the proposal. Ms. Tennor expressed an interest in seeing more historic looking windows on the façade. Mr. Hauser expressed concern with the design of the facade. He said that clerestory windows should not be used and do not fit in the historic district. Mr. Hauser explained the window openings need to match all the other windows in the buildings on the street. He stated the windows proposed for this building are too modern. He suggested eliminating the clerestory windows and using skylights. Mr. Hauser said the windows need to show it is a two story building, and there needs to be a second floor bank of windows which are similar to the other buildings, and a first floor bank of windows. The first floor windows are smaller than those of nearby buildings in an attempt to provide privacy for the residents, but other homes on St. Paul Street do not have small private windows.

Mr. Alexander said the stone foundation of the barn will be salvaged and used as a feature in the courtyard. Mr. Hauser asked about the stone color. Mr. Alexander says the stone color will be a cool gray with a warm gray mixed in to match the surrounding granites. It will have a coarse look and a semi-random pattern. Ms. Stoney asked the Commission if they agree that the garage structures are not of 'unusual importance.' Mr. Tennenbaum asked if any original materials can be re-used. Mr. Alexander stated that almost everything has rotted and he does not think anything can be used. Mr. Hauser wanted to state for the record that he thinks the structure is historically important; they are street side barns which are important to the character of Ellicott City, but are in very poor condition so they can be demolished. Ms. Hilsenrath stated that the barns will be documented by the County Architectural Historian.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to not prevent demolition and to accept the proposed design as presented with the recommendation that the architect consider changes to the vertical elements on the corners and to break up the long expanse of the façade. These changes are to be presented to Staff for review and for approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Badart. The motion was approved by four Commission members and opposed by one.

Chairman Hauser made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Tennor seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 9:22 pm.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Elmina J. Hilsenrath, ASLA
Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary

T:\DPZ\Shared\RCD\HDC\Minutes\2010\March Minutes.docx